

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-8 are pending. Claims 4 and 8 are hereby cancelled. Claims 1-2 and 5-6, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,675,385 to Wang (hereinafter, merely “Wang”).

As understood by Applicants, Wang relates to an MPEG-2 digital TV headend and settop box which includes a method and apparatus for enabling the presentation of electronic program guide (EPG) information. Television program guide information is downloaded from a source of television programming data to the headend of the TV broadcast system. The downloaded EPG data is translated into a plurality of HTML Web pages, which are continuously transmitted as a rotating data carousel in an MPEG-2 data stream. The digital TV settop box further includes a general-purpose web browser responsive to viewer commands to select and

display a selected web page from the rotating carousel of HTML web pages. The digital TV settop further includes a data cache for downloading and storing partial HTML web page EPG information in advance, which reduces the necessary bandwidth allocated for the EPG information, and allows the settop box to quickly display the basic information for a channel related program guide.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...wherein said meta data converting means converts the meta data with the segmentation information and represents the meta data with the segmentation information in a descriptor format of an MPEG system section...” (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in Wang that would teach or suggest the above-identified feature of claim 1. Specifically, Wang does not teach or suggest a meta data converting means that converts the meta data with the segmentation information and represents the meta data with the segmentation information in a descriptor format of an MPEG system section, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the portions of Wang that the Examiner relies upon to reject claims 4 and 8 do not teach or suggest representation in form of a descriptor format of an MPEG system section as recited in the instant claims. Specifically, col. 4, lines 9-30 of Wang merely disclose that Data Streamer 18 generates control maps defining the correspondence between the MPEG-2 packet identifiers of generated MPEG-2 data packets and respective URLs of the group of EPG Web pages as well as other groups of Web pages. Thus, Wang does not teach that the meta data converting means converts the meta data with the segmentation information and represents the meta data with the segmentation information in a descriptor format of an MPEG system section, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 2 and 5-6 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope and are therefore patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and request early passage to issue of the present application.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800